

APPENDIX E: Scores for Kurilpa land use

Table 4: forum scores for activities, land uses & extent for kurilpa development plan *

Activities/ Land uses	Votes for importance	Order of preference	Preferred share of 25 hectare area (%)
Transport-public, active, private; land & water; local & metro)	94	1	<u>3% 1 ha</u>
Open, play, green & ornamental space	91	2=	<u>30 % 8 ha</u>
Natural environment & meditative space	91	2=	<u>15% 4 ha</u>
Housing up to 15 stories	88	4	<u>20% 5 ha</u>
Creative & art industries & start up spaces	81	5	<u>4% 1 ha</u>
Community activities, spaces and	62	6	

structures			<u>5% 1 ha</u>
Public & environmental art	59	7	(included in Community activities & spaces)
Education- pre-school primary, secondary, tertiary & continuing	58	8	<u>7% 1.4 ha</u>
Indigenous culture & arts practice & presentation	54	9	<u>7% 1.4 ha</u>
Recreation, dining entertainment & tourism,	44	10	5 % 1.25 has
Festival & Market Spaces	39	11	(included in community activities & spaces)
Commercial, design professional, info tech & research	22	12	<u>1 % 0.25 has</u>
Housing more than 15 stories	20	13	<u>2% 0.5 has</u>
Retail & shopping supermarket/ fashion/ specialist	16	14	

			<u>1% 0.25 has</u>
Water sensitive design & energy conservation (write in)	12	15	Non spatial
Affordable accommodation (write in)	10	16	15
Health –metropolitan, inner city and local facilities	6	17	
Correctional centre (write in)	1	18	
TOTAL			100%- 25 has.

* This table relates specifically to proposed land uses on the Kurilpa Draft Master Plan site rather than broader policy issues of governance, design or community building. It offers broad indications of proportions of its 25 hectare site which are considered appropriate to be devoted to the 18 different identified potential land uses. Its content is thus not identical with the broader policy concerns of Tables 1-3, but is instead complementary with them, expressing their intended policy outcomes in terms of preferred land uses and their extent. Table 4 is therefore useful in drawing up guidelines for plan preparation by the designated agency for the area or for the Development Brief for any design competition.

All participants voted on the relative importance of different activities and scores varied from 94 for transport issues to 1 for an individual proposal for a correctional facility to assist social integration of inmates. In order to promote use in deciding

priorities for land uses policies, these scores were translated into the orders of preference indicated in the column 3 of the table.

The preferred proportions of space to be devoted to each activity, by contrast, were decided following discussion by members of each Mixed Interest group and then aggregated.

It is interesting that while participants accorded the highest importance of 94 votes to connectivity issues (Transport-public, active, private; land & water; local & metro) they only proposed, on average, devoting 3% of the available space to these activities. This dissonance both recognises the importance of policy development, funding and implementation quite separately from provision of space, and also reflects a widespread underestimation of the amount of space occupied by movement channels and vehicle parking and storage in our cities, which amounts to between 20% and 25% of their total built up areas.